

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 058

CS 503 763

AUTHOR Phelps, Lynn; And Others
TITLE Cross Situational Consistency of Communication Behaviors: A Theoretical Overview, Apprehension, Androgyny, Organizational Relationships: Trust/Satisfaction.

PUB DATE 80
NOTE 60p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Minneapolis, MN, May 21-25, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Androgyny; Anxiety; *Behavior; Behavioral Science Research; *Communication Research; *Environmental Influences; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Relationship; Organizational Communication; *Personality Traits; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Sex Role; *Test Validity; Work Environment

IDENTIFIERS Communication Apprehension; Interpersonal Communication; *Situational Variables

ABSTRACT

Three studies tested the capability of three measurement instruments to predict a communication behavior across a variety of communication situations. The intent of these related studies was to demonstrate the utility of a self-presentation analysis of the concept of personality, an approach postulating that people strive to create the impression that they possess a particular personality attribute solely in response to social reinforcement contingencies. The three studies examined the responses of 278 college students to the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA); the responses of 266 college students to the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), which measures an individual's perception of his or her masculine-feminine behavior; and the responses of 165 university staff personnel to the International Communication Association (ICA) audit relationships scale, which measures an individual's level of trust and communication satisfaction with superiors and coworkers. In each of the studies, subjects completed both the target instrument and an instrument measuring the communication variable of interest across a variety of contexts. Overall, the three studies provided strong support for the "state" theory of the communication variables of apprehension, androgyny, and organizational trust/satisfaction, because the PRCA, the PAQ, and the ICA audit did not consistently predict subjects' responses across a variety of communication situations. (A theoretical overview of self-presentation analysis and situational influences precedes the reports of the three studies.) (RL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED213058

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

CROSS SITUATIONAL CONSISTENCY OF COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS:

A THEORETICAL OVERVIEW by Dr. Lynn Phelps
Dr. Sue DeWine

APPREHENSION by Ms. Bee-Ling Chau
Ms. Marsha Hubbard

ANDROGYNY by Ms. Nancy Noble
Ms. Barbara Tarter

ORGANIZATIONAL
RELATIONSHIPS: by Dr. Sue DeWine
TRUST/SATISFACTION Ms. MaryAnn Samad

Ohio University
1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lynn Phelps

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the International Communication
Association Convention, May, 1981

C5583763

CROSS SITUATIONAL CONSISTENCY OF COMMUNICATION VARIABLES: A THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

Communication journals are replete with studies dealing with the effect of certain personality variables on interpersonal relationships. Variables such as trust, self-esteem, communication apprehension, self disclosure, and feedback are only a few of the personality variables generally believed by researchers to be crucial in the development of effective interpersonal communication.

Underlying much communication research is the assumption that personality variables are relatively enduring or constant. For example, while recognizing that a person may exhibit various levels of trust in different relationships, it is nonetheless assumed that a person who possesses a high level of trust of others will exhibit more trust across a variety of situations than an individual who possesses a low level of trust.

The concept of enduring personality variables has been thought to be crucial to the understanding of human communication since many theorists believe that the concept of personality is a major determinant in understanding communication behaviors exhibited in a wide variety of situations.

Conceptualizations concerning the determinants of personality variables date back at least to antiquity. Hippocrates, the Greek physician, believed that observed differences in human behavior resulted from the dominance of one of four humors in the body. Subsequent

Theorists posited that there was a relationship between the physical characteristics of an individual and his or her underlying personality. But during the early part of this century scholars began to realize that this conception of personality was too simplistic. Early scholars speculated that personality traits reflect innate and enduring qualities of the individual. Allport (1937) proposed that traits were "bona fide mental structures in each personality that account for the consistency in its behavior" (p. 235). Cattell (1950) defined traits as mental structures and proposed that traits were the permanent reaction tendencies of a person that formed the basic unit of personality structure. The status of the concept of personality today reflects the strong influence of these early theorists. Most theorists still tend to characterize individuals according to their enduring types.

In recent years, a number of theorists (e.g., Vernon, 1964; Peterson, 1968; Gergen, 1976) have begun to question the assumptions of traditional conceptions of personality. These investigators have proposed that there is far more variability in behavior than suggested by a traditional view of personality variables as general and enduring dispositions. Mischel (1968) concluded that cross-situational consistencies in behavior remained undemonstrated and that situational specificity of behavior appeared to be the rule rather than the exception. In examining the relevant research, Mischel found that even fairly reliable and presumably valid measures of personality characteristics accounted for less than ten percent of the variance in behavior.

Mischel (1968) has proposed that rather than looking for enduring personality variables, researchers should seek the determinants of behavior in the environmental conditions that covary with an

individual's behavior. Thus, Mischel argues for a situational interpretation of the concept of personality. A situational interpretation contends that rather than being a function of enduring, internal personality structures, an individual's behavior depends on the stimuli in the environment and the probable consequences of the behavior in the situation. Thus, behavior is viewed as a function of external reinforcement contingencies. This suggests that when the same reinforcement contingencies endure over time, behavior will remain relatively stable; however, when there is a change in the conditions that cause behavior then the behavior will also change. Therefore, a situational interpretation of personality proposes that people behave consistently to the extent that the same behavior leads to reinforcing consequences across situations.

Goffman's (1959) self presentational orientation is similar to a situational interpretation but with different emphasis and implications; it proposes that an individual's behavior is solely a response to the perceived reward and punishment contingencies in the environment. Thus, a self presentational orientation shares with a situational interpretation the assumption that behavior can best be explained in terms of external factors. However, unlike a situational interpretation, a self presentational approach concentrates entirely on the social consequences of behavior. That is, a self presentational approach assumes that most of the rewards and punishments that individuals receive are, in fact, mediated by other people. The self presentational interpretation further assumes that there are general cultural norms which indicate to individuals which personality impressions will result in maximum approval and rewards and which will result in

disapproval and punishment. Since others are viewed as mediating rewards and punishments and since others reward those they like and do not reward those they dislike, it follows that individuals will attempt to acquire social approval and avoid social disapproval. From this perspective, then, behavior, is viewed as an attempt to gain approval and rewards and avoid disapproval and punishment from other people. It is, therefore, assumed that in the presence of other people an individual will behave in a manner that he or she expects will result in maximum social rewards and minimum social punishments.

Woodward (1977) concludes:

This reinterpretation, termed a self presentation approach, proposes that individuals attempt to create the impression that they possess certain personality attributes in response to the perceived reward and punishment contingencies in social situations. Thus, behaviors which have been assumed to reflect 'personality' are viewed as instrumental responses designed to gain approval and avoid disapproval from other people. Personality is therefore regarded as an interpersonal, rather than intrapersonal, phenomenon. (p. iii)

The application of a self presentation perspective to the concept of personality suggests that behaviors which have previously been conceptualized as resulting from internal personality characteristics can be reinterpreted as responses to external social reinforcement contingencies. Instead of assuming that an individual's behavior is determined by a collection of personality characteristics this approach argues that behavior is a function of the social approval and social

disapproval that it evokes. Thus, this perspective is consistent with a situational interpretation in proposing that the traditional concept of internalized personality is a dubious utility with respect to the explanation of behavior. However, unlike a situational interpretation, a self presentational approach further specifies that the rewards and punishments that govern the emission of those behaviors which supposedly reflect "personality" are really the result of approval and disapproval of other people. From this perspective, then, personality is entirely an interpersonal phenomenon.

In sum, a self presentational interpretation suggests that rather than possessing enduring and stable personality characteristics like trust, high self-esteem, low communication apprehension, etc., people attempt to generate the impression that they are trusting, possessing high self-esteem, low in communication apprehension, etc., because the cues in their immediate social situations indicate to them that such self presentations will be rewarded. According to this approach, then, people strive to create the impression that they possess a particular personality attribute solely in response to social reinforcement contingencies.

In order to demonstrate the utility of a self presentation analysis of the concept of personality it is necessary to select traditional "personality" variables with which to test the assumptions of this perspective. Woodward (1977) provided preliminary support for the self presentation analysis by demonstrating that the variable of self-esteem is subject to fluctuations depending upon the perceived approval or disapproval an individual experiences. Subjects indicated increased approval for individuals as their level of self-esteem

increased from low to moderate to high but liking dropped sharply at the level of very high self-esteem. Woodward (1977) also concluded that while high self-esteem received approval after a successful outcome, it did not result in approval following an unsuccessful one. Finally, when given the opportunity to present themselves, subjects indicated they utilize their knowledge of the general norms and presented themselves as high in self esteem when attempting to gain approval and as low in self esteem when attempting to gain disapproval.

Recently communication scholars have begun to examine the enduring nature of communication variables. Hewes and Height (1980) have applied a theoretical approach to examining communication behavior, referred to as the "multiple act criteria," in which they have examined the cross-situational consistency of actual behaviors in comparison to trait measures. Parks (1980) challenges the cross-situational consistency of the apprehension instrument developed by McCroskey by asking subjects to respond to an instrument identifying a variety of communication situations. It is the purpose of the present series of studies to extend Parks' research by examining additional communication variables and testing for the self presentation theoretical approach to understanding communication behavior.

Methodology

The intent of the following three studies was to test for cross-situational consistencies of selected communication variables. First, three communication instruments were selected: the PRCA (Personal Report of Communication Apprehension) which measures an individual's level of communication apprehension generally, the PAQ (Personal

Attributes Questionnaire) which measures an individual's perception of their own masculine or feminine behavior at one point in time, and the ICA audit relationships scale which measures an individual's level of trust and communication satisfaction with superiors and co-workers (Goldhaber & Porter, 1979). All three studies follow the same procedures outlined by Parks (1980) in his test of the PRCA. In essence, then, one study is a replication of the Parks study while the other two follow the same reasoning and methodology to test selected communication variables.

In two of the studies a situational specific instrument was developed to measure the communication variable of interest across a variety of contexts. In the third study Parks' (1980) instrument was employed. The Situational Specific Measurement Inventory (SSMI) was developed in the following way for each study: 50-70 communication situations were generated representing seven different contexts: (1) Size of group, (2) Familiarity with other in the interaction, (3) Authority or clearly defined roles, (4) Intimacy of information shared, (5) Confinement, (6) Ambiguity, and (7) Channels of communication. For example, one communication situation indicating a high level of intimacy of information might be the following: "Telling someone about a personal health problem." A panel of five expert judges sorted the situations into each of the categories and only those situations achieving .80 interrater reliability were retained. A stratified sample representing a variety of situational types was retained so that each SSMI instrument had 35 communication situations identified. The original instrument and the SSMI were administered to 278 subjects in the first study, 266 subjects in the second study,

and 174 subjects in the third. Subjects were volunteer students from basic communication courses or work-study students at a large mid-western university. The following statistical tests for differences were used. A test for difference between the subgroups on the original instrument (low to high apprehension groups on the PRCA; androgyny, masculine and feminine groups on the PAQ; and low to high trust groups on the ICA relationship scale) and the total sum score on the new instruments representing 35 communication situations, was completed with an analysis of variance. The new instruments were submitted to a factor analysis to determine the uniqueness of communication situations represented. The factors that were identified through the factor analysis were submitted to a multiple regression procedure in which the factor scores from the factor analysis were regressed upon the original instrument (PRAC, PAQ, and ICA relationship scale). The final analysis was a MANOVA in which the four subgroups derived from the original instruments served as the independent variable and the factors derived from the factor analyses from the 35 situational instrument served as dependent variables. The final analysis was used to determine the predictability of the original instrument across a variety of communication situations. In all three studies two criteria had to be satisfied before the original instrument could be considered an adequate measure of cross situationally consistent communication traits. First, there should be a significant and positive relationship between the original instrument scores and the sum of scores on the situational instrument on at least some of the situations examined. Second, there should be no statistically significant differences in the original instrument's ability to predict the communication behavior from one

situation to another. The former is a goodness of fit criterion while the latter is the cross situationally consistency criterion.

The following studies identify three communication behaviors (communication apprehension, androgyny, and trust/satisfaction) that have been treated as traits by the instruments used to measure them. This series of studies tests for the instruments' ability to predict a communication behavior across a variety of communication situations. If the original instrument is not predictive of communication behavior across 35 situations described in the SSMI, then we may well question most of the conclusions drawn from previous research about these communication variables. If, on the other hand, the original instruments are able to predict the level of communication behavior across various communication situations, then previous researchers have adequately accounted for flexibility of communication behavior.

References

- Allport, G. W. Personality: A psychological interpretation. New York: Holt, 1937.
- Cattell, R. B. Personality: A systematic, theoretical, and factual study. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
- Gergen, K. J. Social psychology, science and history. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1976, 2, 373-383.
- Goldhaber, G. M., & Rogers, D. P. Auditing organizational communication systems: The ICA audit. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall-Hunt, 1979.
- Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.
- Mischel, W. Personality and assessment. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1968.
- McCroskey, J. Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research, 1977, 4, 78-96.
- Peterson, D. R. The clinical study of social behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.
- Parks, M. A test of the cross-situational consistency of communication apprehension. Communication Monographs, 1980, 47, 220-232.
- Spence, J., and Helmreich, R. Masculinity & femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates & antecedents. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1978.
- Vernon, P. E. Personality assessment: A critical survey. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Woodward, C. Self esteem: A self presentation interpretation.

Unpublished dissertation, University of Southern California, 1977.

CROSS SITUATIONAL CONSISTENCY OF COMMUNICATION VARIABLES: APPREHENSION

The purpose of this study was to test the cross-situational consistency of communication apprehension (CA) to determine whether it is a trait or state characteristic as measured in McCroskey's Personal Report on Communication Apprehension (PRCA) instrument.

McCroskey (1977) defined CA as "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (p. 78). It is an area of study clearly of concern to the field of interpersonal communication, particularly since it is with little doubt that a high level of oral CA has a negative impact on communication behavior and the development of effective communication interactions. Although CA has been treated in the literature as a relatively enduring or constant communication trait, the current debate centers on conceptualizing it as either a "trait" or "state" variable.

McCroskey (1977) states that trait apprehension is fear or anxiety in many types of oral communication situations while state anxiety is specific to a given oral communication situation, such as giving a public speech, acting in a play, or being interviewed for a new job. McCroskey also notes that "while state CA is a normal experience of most people, trait CA is not characteristic of normal well-adjusted individuals" (p. 79).

The PRCA purports to measure trait rather than state CA. It has

been used in more than 60 studies and is the most common instrument used to measure the enduring quality of trait CA.

Sample questions from the PRCA indicating trait CA are: "I talk less because I am shy" or "I find the prospect of speaking mildly pleasant." Past research cited by McCroskey (1977) has found significant correlations between verbal activity and CA. Upon closer examination of other items on the PRCA, it may be found to measure state CA, such as: "I would enjoy presenting a speech on a local TV show" and "I feel self-conscious when I am called upon to answer a question or give an opinion in class." The inclusion of these types of "state" items might suggest that apprehension should be treated as a state quality, thus the purpose of the present study.

However, existing theories have regarded trait CA as a 'cognitively experienced phenomenon' (McCroskey, 1978) and the self-report inventory format of the PRCA as a superior technique over other measures like observers' ratings and physiological responses. The latter two are more appropriate for measuring the state CA (Lohr, et al., 1980).

In order to assert that a certain personality variable is a relatively permanent trait, it must be supported by evidence which shows that this trait is stable and thereby consistently exhibited regardless of the context in which the behavior occurs.

Cross-situational consistency is another significant aspect to the conceptualization of trait CA. Allport (1937) emphasized the consistency of response as a major characteristic of traits. Parks (1980) stated that the degree of cross-situational consistency directly determines the power of conceptualizing CA as a trait. Thus, if the

behavior is consistent across situations then it supports trait explanation; if not, the behavior is situationally determined. While it may be impossible to adhere to a strict definition of consistency, Parks also identified researchers whose definition of CA allows for some fluctuation across situations which may occur under certain "transient situational effects" but overall, persons with high CA will experience more anxiety across situations.

The research question examined was "Does the PRCA measure trait and/or state characteristics?" The objective and the findings of this research should contribute to the development of an alternative perspective toward the current theoretical conceptualization of CA and illuminate more clearly the specific attributes and limitations of the PRCA.

Research by McCroskey, Daly, Richmond and Cox (1975) has indicated that the level of communication apprehension (CA) exhibited by an individual remains constant once measured. This trait approach to CA has been the focus of much of the research on communication apprehension.

McCroskey (1978) and Daly (1978) support the reliability and validity of the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension instrument (PRCA), the most commonly used instrument to measure oral CA. McCroskey (1978) reviewed the research which used the PRCA to measure the construct of oral CA and concluded that the PRCA is a reliable and valid measure of that construct. Internal reliability estimates ranged from .92 to .96. Test-re-test reliability ($N=762$) over a seven-week period was .82.

In Daly's (1978) article the more commonly used measures of social

anxiety in terms of empirical research equivalence were compared. Fourteen instruments were selected which represented three conceptual groups--performance, communicative and social anxiety. Included in the communicative anxiety group was the PRCA, which was one of the three found to have the most reliability in terms of internal consistency (91).

Numerous studies have treated CA as a trait dimension. For example, McCroskey and Anderson (1976) reported four studies measuring CA in one context in relationship to subjects' reactions to various instructional design techniques.

McCroskey, Daly, and Sorensen (1975) found significant relationships between CA and 18 of 21 variables studied. High CA was found to be associated with a wide range of maladaptive personality characteristics. From this and previous research, the authors generate an empirically based picture of high and low CA's treating CA as a trait.

Daly, Richmond, and Leth (1979), in a series of three studies, tested CA as a trait correlated with similarity. Freimuth (1976) tested the effects of CA on communication effectiveness, to determine a consistent personality trait's impact on sociability. McCroskey, Daly, Richmond, and Cox (1975) examined the effects of CA on interpersonal attraction in ratings by the opposite sex.

McCroskey, Daly, Richmond, and Falcione (1977), in a study correlating self-esteem and CA (using the PRCA), found a consistent relationship between CA as a trait and self-esteem. Goss, Thompson, and Olds (1978) tested systematic desensitization for CA, as a method of reducing apprehension and increasing self-esteem. Jordan and Powers (1978) studied the effect of CA as a trait, and social and personal

settings upon verbal behavior. Burgon and Burgon (1974) attempted to find a better and more direct measure of CA than the PRCA by creating a new scale to measure what they labeled unwillingness to communicate. The authors found the new scale was a better and more direct predictor of communication predispositions (traits) than the other instruments used.

Recent research challenges the assumption that apprehension is a trait, i.e., consistently exhibited across all situations, but instead may vary according to the individual's self-presentation in each unique setting. For example, Parks (1980) tested the cross-situational consistency of the PRCA. In addition to completing the PRCA, subjects were asked to report how much anxiety they would feel or have felt in 35 situations.

In Beatty's report (1980), dynamic and stable qualities of CA were examined from an Assimilation Theory perspective; however, this study represents or reflects a growing movement away from the trait explanation, i.e., levels of CA are present and do emerge in the presence of some intervening variables.

Beatty, Behnke, and McCallum (1980) studied CA in two situations. This study does not support the trait conceptualization. The authors note that the PRCA yields scores which vary from situation to situation; thus, it is sensitive to state characteristics, and it is not clear if the PRCA should be considered a state or trait measure.

Richmond (1978) attempted to overcome the problems of external validity by examining the impact of both state and trait CA in dyadic relationships in a naturalistic setting for acquaintance relationships. She found the trait/state correlation more significant in the early but

not later stages of a relationship. Richmond calls for more attention to be paid to state CA in future research.

Research Design

The research design in this study attempts to closely replicate previous research by Parks who challenged the trait conceptualization of CA determined by the PRCA, and thereby its cross-situational consistency. Parks' procedure used the PRCA to measure the overall level of CA in subjects. He also developed a 35-item questionnaire comprised of an assortment of communication situations in which anxiety may be experienced.

Parks' questionnaire was generated from an initial pool of approximately 150 communication situations which satisfied three criteria. First, each item describes a situation involving communication and does invoke anxiety. Second, the 150 items were categorized along six common situational dimensions so as to ensure clearly different classifications of situations. These dimensions were: size of groups, familiarity with others, presence of authority figures, level of confinement, intimacy of information, and nature of expected behavior. Third, Parks then randomly selected 35 situations from these dimensions.

The questionnaire was used in conjunction with the PRCA to test its cross-situational consistency. Parks offered two major conditions which the PRCA must satisfy before being considered an adequate measure of a cross-situational consistent trait. The first one is a "goodness of measure criterion" whereby there should be a "significant and positive correlation between PRCA scores and the anxiety scores

(from Parks' questionnaire) for at least some of the situations." The second is a cross-situational criterion where there should "not be any statistically significant differences in the PRCA's ability to predict anxiety from one situation to another."

The specific hypothesis tested was: Does the PRCA accurately predict trait scores across a variety of communication situations as measured by the Parks instrument?

Methodology

A total of 278 subjects from a basic undergraduate communication course volunteered to participate in the study. There were 130 males, 145 females and four others who did not identify their gender, although their responses were used. The subjects' ages ranged from 17 to 44 years.

Each subject completed McCroskey's 25-item Personal Report on Communication Apprehension (PRCA) and Parks' questionnaire of 35 communication situations. Both measurements were administered at the same time.

Following Parks' procedure, the PRCA scores were divided into quartiles or subgroups. The subjects in the first quartile were designated low CA's (59 and below); the second quartile was classified as midlow CA's (60-69); the third quartile was composed of midhigh CA's (70-79); and the group which ranked fourth made up the final quartile (80 and above).

For the Parks questionnaire, each subject was requested to indicate his or her level of anxiety in each of the 35 communication situations, along a 9-point scale from "not anxious" to "very anxious."

A high score on the total number of situations will therefore indicate a high level of anxiety. Likewise, a low score will indicate a low level of anxiety. In addition to the 35 situations, subjects were also asked to record whether they have or have not been in each of the situations.

Analysis

Two ANOVA procedures were administered. The first was a one-way ANOVA (one-tailed) between the subgroups or four levels, and the total sum of anxiety scores for the 35 situations. Contrast tests were then executed to determine differences between each pair of subgroups.

The first ANOVA did not reveal any significant differences among the four groups' total anxiety scores and the PRCA ($F=.81, df=3, 277$). Anxiety scores did increase as the level of PRCA increased: Lows had a mean of 174.75 ($SD=67.15$), medium lows had a mean of 179.07 ($SD=54.31$), medium highs had a mean of 182.31 ($SD=42.09$), and the high CA's group had a mean of 187.87 ($SD=31.55$). The contrast tests did not reveal any significant differences among the subgroups. When compared with the results the Parks study obtained, although he found some relationship between the PRCA and the total level of anxiety, neither study demonstrated a strong relationship. The results could suggest two things: one, the PRCA might not have adequately predicted low and high anxiety, or two, the Parks questionnaire does not measure the different levels of anxiety.

The second ANOVA procedure was used to test for differences between the subgroups and the number of times the subjects were actually in the situations. Contrast tests were also requested to identify which pairs of groups had actually been in more of the communication

situations.

The second ANOVA yielded significant differences between the subgroups and the number of situations in which the subjects had actually participated ($F=5.69, df=3, 277$). The midlow CA group reported being in the most situations (mean=30.09), followed by the high CA with mean of 28.19; the low CA reported being an average of 22.14. The contrast tests showed the midlow group significantly different from the high CA's ($F=8.27$); the midlow group was also significantly different from the midhigh CA's; the high CA's were significantly different from both the midlows and the midhigh CA groups. Comparisons among the means showed that the high CA group had been in more of the situations than low CA group. The situations, therefore, were representative of the situations people actually experience in everyday life. Subjects indicated that they had been in approximately 76% of the situations (mean=76.07). Variations in participation were also observed. Only 13% reported that they had expressed their opinion to a TV newsperson, while 50% had thanked a relative for a gift.

Analysis of Situational Differences

A factor analysis was used to identify if the 35 situations actually did represent different communication contexts. The scores on the 35 anxiety situations were subjected to a common factor analysis with varimax rotation to determine the number of factors. A two-factor solution was found using the "eigenvalue greater than or equal to 1.0" criterion. The first factor accounted for 58.5% of the variance, the second for 16.45% of the variance.

The factor analysis identified two general types of situations in

which the subjects experienced anxiety. The criteria for loadings for both factors was set at greater than .50 on the primary factor and a loading no greater than .40 on the secondary factor. The first factor had 22 items found to have considerable loadings consisting of situations in which the subjects were likely to know the other people in the interaction. This factor was identified as the dimension of "familiarity with others" and is the same as the one identified by Parks in his own study. The second factor which had five items with high loadings was identified as the dimension of "size of group." (See Table 1)

Analysis of Cross-Situational Consistency

Finally, to test the PRCA's cross-situational consistency, the data was submitted to a multiple regression in which the two factors found to have considerable loadings were regressed upon the PRCA scores. A MANOVA procedure was also performed with the two-factor indices serving as dependent variables and the four levels of PRCA as independent variables.

Results for the multiple regression yielded a significant multiple correlation ($R=.14P<.001$) for Factor 1 but yielded no significant correlation for Factor 2. These results indicate that the PRCA successfully predicted scores for Factor 1 (familiarity of other) but was not predictive of Factor 2 (size of group). The MANOVA procedure found a significant multivariate effect for CA ($Wilks2=.96$, $F=4.04$, $df=2,254$, $P<.01$). These results suggested that the linear combination of the two factors was related to the PRCA, but not equally, thus indicating that this relationship was not cross-situational consistent.

Summary

This study yielded results similar to Parks' research. The first major criterion for cross-situational consistency was fulfilled. The PRCA was significantly and positively correlated with the anxiety index for at least one of the situational dimensions, that is Factor 1 representing "familiarity with others." However, the second condition was not fulfilled. To reiterate, this criterion stated that there should be no significant differences in the PRCA's ability to predict anxiety from one situation to another. The results indicated that the PRCA predicted Factor 1 better, when subjects were more or less likely to know the other persons or person, than Factor 2 where the size of group would have an impact on the anxiety level at that given time and place. Thus, cross-situational consistency was not found in the PRCA in this study.

From these findings, it is safe to concur that the PRCA does not adequately measure trait CA and may instead indicate situational variability of CA. This supports Parks' own research findings.

Table 1

Communication Apprehension

Concent, Descriptive Statistics and Factor Loadings for Situations

Item	Mean	SD	Factor I Loading	Factor II Loading
1. Telling the people you are with at a party that you wish to leave.	4.94	2.28	0.47	-0.09
2. Asking a person out whom you haven't dated before.	5.92	2.21	0.39	0.25
3. Saying hello to a stranger of the same sex who smiles at you on the street.	4.49	2.80	0.74	0.49
4. Telling your roommate when you are going to return as you leave.	4.23	2.82	0.76	.002
5. Kissing a date for the first time.	6.58	2.32	0.31	0.21
6. Asking a friend to lend you five dollars.	4.77	2.20	0.03	0.20
7. Talking about a personal health problem to an unfamiliar doctor of the opposite sex.	4.61	2.55	0.33	0.44
8. Asking a friend to go to a movie with you.	5.04	2.95	0.89	0.0004
9. Expressing agreement with one of your parents' comments at the dinner table.	4.98	3.02	0.87	0.0002
10. Leading the service in church.	4.48	2.84	0.29	0.27
11. Presenting a slide show about a recent trip in front of your family.	4.65	2.86	0.65	0.08
12. Calling someone you don't know on the phone.	5.01	2.29	0.11	0.56
13. Telling a door-to-door salesperson that you don't want to buy anything.	5.07	2.56	0.50	0.21
14. Asking someone you are with what time it is.	4.94	3.22	0.88	0.004
15. Leading a group discussion in class.	4.83	2.39	0.23	0.657
16. Expressing your opinion to a TV newsperson.	5.56	2.27	0.27	0.491
17. Asking an acquaintance to go get a cup of coffee or tea with you.	4.94	2.48	0.76	0.119

Table 1 (continued)

Item	Mean	SD	Factor I Loading	Factor II Loading
18. Telling someone you've been dating for some time how much you care for him/her.	6.33	2.68	0.57	0.09
19. Asking a close friend's opinion of your clothes.	5.02	2.67	0.77	0.04
20. Looking directly into your date's eyes.	5.99	2.92	0.68	0.09
21. Asking a close friend to listen to a personal problem of yours.	5.66	2.59	0.65	0.05
22. Telling a joke to a small group of casual friends.	5.57	2.87	0.79	0.03
23. Refusing permission to a younger person in your care to do something.	4.41	2.29	0.65	0.18
24. Touching the arm of someone you've dated only a couple of times.	5.42	2.75	0.61	0.18
25. Asking a salesperson the price of something.	4.96	2.77	0.75	0.15
26. Telling the person nearest to the button what floor you want on a crowded elevator.	4.79	2.59	0.68	0.37
27. Thanking a relative who has given you a gift.	5.58	2.94	0.82	0.06
28. Interviewing for a job.	6.01	2.18	0.00	0.69
29. Striking up a conversation with an opposite-sex stranger on a plane.	5.66	2.25	0.38	0.57
30. Asking a stranger for directions in a strange city.	5.40	2.37	0.58	0.44
31. Asking a question in a large class.	4.92	2.32	0.64	0.74
32. Asking a classmate to let you borrow his/her notes.	5.11	2.35	0.69	0.31
33. Introducing a friend to a group of other people that you know.	5.44	2.74	0.81	0.15
34. Asking for separate checks for a group of you at a restaurant.	4.80	2.52	0.68	0.22
35. Telling someone you've been dating for some time that you want to break it off.	5.24	2.75	0.33	0.28

References

- Beatty, J. J. An assimilation theory perspective of communication apprehension. Human Communication Research, 1980, 6, 319-325.
- Beatty, M. J., Behnke, R. R., and McCallum, K. Situational perspective of communication apprehension. Human Communication Research, 1980, 6, 319-325.
- Burgoon, J., and Burgoon, M. Unwillingness to communicate, anomia-alienation and communication apprehension as predictors of small group communication. Journal of Psychology, 1974, 88, 31-38.
- Daly, J. A. The assessment of social-communicative anxiety via self-reports: A comparison of measures. Human Communication Research, 1978, 45, 204-218.
- Daly, J. A., Richmond, V. P., and Leth, S. Social communication anxiety and the personnel selection process: Testing the similarity effect in selection decisions. Human Communication Research, 1979, 5, 17-31.
- Freimuth, V. S. The effects of communication apprehension on communicative effectiveness. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3, 289-298.
- Goss, B., Thompson, M., and Olds, S. Behavioral support for systematic desensitization for communication apprehension. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 158-163.
- Jordan, W. J., and Powers, W. G. Verbal behavior as a function of apprehension and social context. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 294-300.

- McCroskey, J. C. Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research, 1977, 4, 78-96.
- McCroskey, J. C. Validity of the PRCA as an index of oral communication apprehension. Communication Monographs, 1978, 45, 192-203.
- McCroskey, J. C., and Anderson, J. C. The relationship between communication apprehension and academic achievement among college students. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3, 73-81.
- McCroskey, J., Daly, J., Richmond, V., and Cox, G. The effects of communication apprehension on interpersonal attraction. Human Communication Research, 1975, 2, 51-65.
- McCroskey, J. C., Daly, J., Richmond, V., and Falcione, P. C. Studies of the relationship between communication apprehension and self-esteem. Human Communication Research, 1977, 3, 269-277.
- McCroskey, J. C., Daly, J. C., and Sorensen, G. Personality correlates of communication apprehension. Human Communication Research, 1975, 2, 376-380.
- Parks, M. R. A test of the cross-situational consistency of communication apprehension. Communication Monographs, 1980, 47, 220-232.
- Richmond, V. P. The relationship between trait and state communication apprehension and interpersonal perceptions during acquaintance stages. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 338-349.

CROSS SITUATIONAL CONSISTENCY OF COMMUNICATION VARIABLES: ANDROGyny

Recent researchers have begun to examine the impact of psychological gender on communication behaviors in contrast to examining biological sex difference. The previous approach of using biological sex as a research variable is no longer sufficient with the changing conceptualization of sex roles (Brown, 1978). This new approach presents the individual not as a captive of his or her biological sex but rather as the product of their psychological gender. Released from the restrictions of biological sex, an individual may possess both masculine and feminine traits (Fitzpatrick and Indivik, 1980). This type of individual has been termed androgynous. It is the purpose of this study to test for the cross situational consistency of the androgynous trait.

According to Bem (1974), androgynous individuals are those which have incorporated both masculine and feminine personality components into a positive self-image (Siegel, 1980). In light of the current societal challenges to the traditional sex role distinctions, this concept of the androgynous individual has been widely accepted (Lowry & Jones, 1980).

The support for the concept of androgyny and the psychological sex role has also come from the realization that individuals cannot be always clearly distinguished by masculine and feminine characteristics, as many individuals are often both assertive and yielding, both instrumental and expressive, on both masculine and feminine scales (Koontz, 1980).

The use of a theory which is sensitive to psychological sex differences rather than biological has provided much clearer findings in the sex-role research (Clavier & Walker, 1980).

This new approach to the study of sex-roles was greatly supported by the development of the Bem Sex Role Inventory in 1974 by Sandra Bem. According to Siegel, 1980, Bem based her study on two primary hypotheses: (1) that males and females alike may possess both masculine and feminine qualities and individuals exhibit either type of behavior depending upon the situation, and (2) individuals who identify strongly with only one of the sex roles may suffer from a limited range of situational behaviors.

Bem formed the BSMI by asking 2,000 college students to determine from 60 personality traits which were more desirable for males or females (Brown, 1980). This type of questionnaire design may allow for more of a stereotypical than reality-based structure.

After dividing the traits into three categories of 20 feminine traits, 20 masculine traits, and 20 neutral, Bem asked individuals to rate how characteristic the trait was of them, to determine the degree of androgyny each possessed.

Since, the development of the BSRI, a new measuring instrument has developed eliminating much of the criticism which has been leveled against the BSMI. The Personal Attribute Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence & Helmreich, 1974, 1975) eliminated much of the stereotypical characteristics of the BSMI questionnaire by asking respondents to judge where the ideal individual would be placed with respect to the different traits. By choosing those responses which were agreed upon by both sexes the questionnaire covers mainly those traits favorably regarded of both

sexes but less stereotypical than those of the BSMI.

Spence and Helmreich also use a bipolar scale for their ratings of the different traits instead of simply asking subjects if they possess a trait. This adds more accuracy to the scale. For these reasons the PAQ has been chosen for the purpose of the study.

Review of Literature

Since the development of the BSMI and PAQ, androgyny has been tested and correlated with many other variables. Lowry and Jones (1980) administered both the Norton Communicator Style Questionnaire (CSM) and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) to ninety-one subjects in introductory communication courses to ascertain if psychological gender more accurately determines the variance in communicator style than would gender alone. The BSMI did produce a more significant model as it classified more cases than did the biological sex of the individual. The androgyny measure was seen as a determinant of an individual's own perception of his or her sex role. Thus, the results were seen as a trait of an individual rather than a state.

A study by Pier and Nordstrom (1980), was based on using the BSRI and the Hersey-Blanchard Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description for 30 adult leaders of small groups. The existing relationship between leadership style to sex-role was determined by a Pearson Product Moment correlation of the two tests. Relating leadership style to sex-role, the researchers referred to Bormann's (1969) definition of roles as "field invariant traits, which remain stable as a person moves from group to group, as contrasted with field variant behaviors, which are determined by the social field and change within the situation."

Androgynous individuals were seen as those with the largest field invariant traits, which could help them to modify their behavior to fit many situations.

Employing the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) and the Self-Report Language Intensity Measure (LIM), Loontz (1980) studied the language intensity exhibited by 287 students enrolled in introductory speech courses. The results indicating greater language intensity in androgynous individuals were seen as traits from which researchers could formulate "more precise predictions in numerous areas of research."

Healy (1980), in his study of perceptions and the relationship between androgyny and speech communication stress, defined androgyny as a "complex of traits to which social desirability is ascribed but are considered to vary between the sexes, but appear independent of sex."

Using both the Bem Sex Role Inventory and the Wheelless and Grotz Self-Disclosure Scales (1978), Jacobson and Shellen (1980) studied 106 subjects from various places of employment to discover any relationships existing between androgyny and self-disclosure. Once again, the characteristics measured by the scales were generalized to all situations.

Brunner and Phelps (1980) examined the relationship between interpersonal competence and androgyny. After finding androgynous individuals had higher levels of many of the characteristics associated with interpersonal communication competence, the assumption was made that if the individual was typed as androgynous than this trait would make them more competent as a communicator. Each of these studies has consistently measured psychological gender as an unchanging trait.

Albrecht and Cooley (1980) have defined androgyny as the capability of an individual to employ a full range of human character traits, both

masculine and feminine in different situations.

The philosophy of the PAQ is to test the flexibility of an individual in different situations, yet the methodology which is used for this determination denies any variability of characteristics since it only measures behavior at one point in time and in one context. Will an individual, regardless of psychological sex type, react the same in an ambiguous situation as one with less ambiguity; i.e., speaking in front of a group of strangers versus a group of close friends?

If it can be shown that responses vary across situations then the use of the present psychological sex inventories used to measure this "state" will have to be modified. A modification of the questionnaire, through the use of a wide number of situations, should allow a more accurate measure of the "state" of androgyny rather than the traditional measure of androgyny as a "trait".

Problem Statement

The research area of interest in this study is to determine if androgynous traits are consistent across a variety of communication situations. While the concept of androgyny suggests flexibility of trait, the instruments used to test it are situationally bound. In other words, the instruments measure the trait at one point in time rather than measuring across a variety of communication situations.

Methodology

A sample of 266 volunteers (125 males, 136 females and 5 unidentified) students from a large midwestern university completed the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), a scale which classifies

subjects into four psychological gender categories based on two dimensions: masculinity and femininity. Thus, androgynous subjects received high scores on both scales, sex-typed (masculine, feminine) high on one scale and low on the other. Placements of subjects into gender categories followed criteria and scoring recommended by Bem (1974) and by Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1975). Using the median score procedure, 266 subjects were classified into 105 (39%) androgynous, 36 (14%) sex-typed males, 63 (24%) sex-typed females, and 62 (23%) undifferentiated.

In the second part of the questionnaire subjects were asked to respond to two items for each of 35 situations. One asked them to indicate how dominate they would feel or have felt in each situation. This dimension of dominance was selected from the original PAQ instrument because previous research indicated that dominance distinguished between masculine and feminine traits (i.e. high factor loading of .718 as an instrument trait and low loading as an expressive factor (feminine). See: Eman & Dierks-Stewart, 1980). Responses were recorded along a nine-point scale anchored by the phrases "Very Submissive" and "Very Dominant." Higher scores reflected higher levels of dominance. The second item asked subjects to report whether they had ever actually been in each situation.

The 35 situations were developed in three steps. First, an initial pool of 70 common communication situations were generated. Each item was worded so that it clearly involved communication. Second, items were sorted by five impartial judges into common situations of: (1) size of group, (2) familiarity of others, (3) presence of ambiguity, (4) intimacy of information, (5) authority figures or defined roles. Third, only those items which had .80 interjudge agreement were left in

item pool, a stratified sample. Thirty-five items were then selected representing each of the five categories. This new instrument, the Situational Specific Measurement Instrument for Androgyny (SSMIA), was used to test for the enduring traits of androgyny.

Research Question

Does the PAQ accurately predict trait scores across a variety of communication situations as measured by the SSMIA?

Results

In the first global analysis an ANOVA procedure was used to test for differences between the androgyny subgroups and their total dominance score for the 35 situations.

Significant differences among the four groups' total dominance scores ($F = 4.14$, $df = 3, 262$ $p < .05$) resulted. The means for androgyny ($\bar{X} = 196.30$) and Masculinity ($\bar{X} = 195.19$) for the 35 situations were most similar, while the sex-typed feminine ($\bar{X} = 178.90$) and undifferentiated ($\bar{X} = 178.16$) were much alike. A series of linear contrasts were performed and significant differences were found between androgyny and feminine sex-typed ($F = 7.34$, $df = 265$ $p < .05$), androgyny and undifferentiated ($F = 7.89$ $df = 265$ $p < .05$) and masculinity and undifferentiated ($F = 3.93$ $df = 265$ $p < .05$). These results suggest that the PAQ and the total level of dominance are somewhat related.

Upon examining the relationship between the PAQ and the total number of situations in which the subjects had actually participated it was found that they had been in 60 percent of the total situations with the mean being 21.48.

Analysis of Situational Differences

A test of cross situational consistency requires the identification of situations or class of situations which are clearly different from one another. A factor analysis was used as a way of determining if unique communication situations were represented in SSMIA.

Scores on the SSMIA for the 35 situations were submitted to a factor analysis with varimax rotation to determine the number of factors. Nine factors were identified using the "eigenvalue greater than or equal to 1.0." Two factors were retained with the first factor accounting for 18 percent of the variance and the second for 14 percent. The factor analysis identified two general classes of situations in which dominance is expressed in different ways. Inspection of the factors suggested that Factor 1 was related to "presence of authority figures or role differentiation" while Factor 2 dealt with "familiarity with others" (See Table 1).

Analysis of Cross-Situational Consistency

A multiple regression procedure was conducted regressing the two highest loading factors upon the PAQ instrument. Results yielded a significant multiple correlation for the 2nd factor ($R = .24$, $p < .05$) but not for Factor 1 ($R = .16$, NS). These findings indicated that the PAQ does predict the androgynous trait for the "familiarity with other" variable, but not in role contexts.

A MANOVA procedure was then performed in which the original instrument served as the independent variable and the two factors as independent variables. A significant relationship was found for the PAQ (Wilks $\lambda = .93$, $F = 2.94$, $df = 6, 514$, $p < .05$). These results suggested that the

linear combination of the two factors was related to the PAQ. As one factor was found to be significant and one was not this suggested that the PAQ was not related to the two indices in a similar way.

Discussion

Parks (1980) states that the explanatory value of trait conceptualization is directly determined by their degree of cross-situational consistency. In Parks' research he stated that one necessary and one sufficient criterion must be conformed with for any trait measure to be cross-situationally consistent. The goodness of fit criterion was fulfilled in that it was significantly and positively correlated with the psychological gender index for at least one of the situation dimensions, Factor 2, representing "familiarity with others." However, the second criterion of no significant differences in the PAQ's ability to predict psychological gender from one situation to another, was not met. The PAQ was found not to predict Factor 1 which related to the "role" context. Thus, cross situational consistency was not found in the PRCA in this study.

It would seem that the PAQ instrument as an approach to measurement is not cross-situational in its format. It measured androgyny as a trait and does not seem to possess the flexibility to identify the variability of the psychological gender characteristics. It therefore, seems that the use of the PAQ is not predictive in varying contexts and still leaves in question the "state-trait" nature of psychological gender.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Factor Loading for
Androgyny Situational Instrument

	Mean	SD	Factor I Loading	Factor II Loading
1. Telling a door-to-door salesman you don't want to buy anything.	6.07	2.05	.02	.22
2. Asking an acquaintance to go to have coffee or tea with you.	6.13	2.07	.17	.58
3. Presenting a slide show about a recent trip in front of your family.	6.13	2.58	.55	.10
4. Giving a presentation to a small class.	5.96	2.10	.13	.70
5. Telling your boss you want the day off.	5.45	2.18	.08	.25
6. Confessing to a priest or minister.	3.88	2.40	.17	.33
7. Telling someone you've been dating for sometime that you want to break it off.	4.74	2.49	.09	-.02
8. Telling a younger person in your care to do something.	7.24	1.77	.28	.33
9. Asking a friend out whom you haven't dated before.	4.75	2.25	.04	.11
10. Telling your parents you care about them.	5.76	2.56	.00	.30
11. Telling your boss his wife is having an affair.	2.59	2.13	.44	-.24
12. Asking about a job unrelated to your field of study.	5.16	2.23	.17	.07
13. Telling your problems to a close friend.	6.49	2.22	.05	.33
14. Asking your parents for money.	5.83	2.34	.10	-.13
15. Telling a professor you did not finish an assignment.	4.27	2.10	.18	.07
16. Confronting a teacher about a grade change.	5.91	2.33	.17	.14
17. Asking your sibling about something that was borrowed.	7.00	2.01	.07	.15
18. Talking to a friend in the hospital about his illness.	5.28	2.17	.20	.26
19. Being asked to make dinner for your spouse's boss.	4.54	2.34	.74	.08
20. Speaking to an individual at a party whom you've never met before.	6.08	2.11	.15	.54

Table 1 continued

	Mean	SD	Factor I Loading	Factor II Loading
21. Talking to an administrator about a complaint regarding a subordinate.	5.10	2.20	.57	.13
22. Leading a toast to the guest of honor at a large luncheon.	5.22	2.67	.63	.22
23. Speaking to the manager in a job interview for a position you are seeking.	6.10	2.07	.18	.66
24. Filing a grievance with your supervisor.	5.23	2.36	.43	.15
25. Talking with a relative whom you haven't seen in a number of years.	5.64	2.07	.01	.43
26. Giving a lecture to the Kiwanis Club.	4.16	2.44	.71	.16
27. Asking a policeman for directions to a movie theatre.	6.4	2.45	.38	.37
28. Sharing your failure in a project with a next-door neighbor.	4.70	2.22	.38	-.03
29. Asking a librarian for reference materials.	6.70	2.05	.05	.31
30. Telling a close friend that a relative has died.	5.19	2.55	-.03	.07
31. Asking questions of a professor in a large lecture class.	4.54	2.38	.01	.29
32. Sharing with your mother that she will soon be a grandmother.	5.24	2.87	.27	-.09
33. Talking with your boss about a convention.	5.21	2.39	.68	.07
34. Asking your friend if you are too assertive.	5.36	2.25	.37	.09
35. Asking for directions in a foreign country where you don't know the language.	4.46	2.60	.20	.10

References

- Albrecht, T. L., & Cooley, R. E. Androgyny and communication strategies for relational dominance: An empirical analysis. Communication Yearbook 4, New Brunswick: ICA, 1980.
- Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 1974, 155-162.
- _____. The measurement of psychological andrgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.
- Brown, J. D. Adolescent-peer group communication, sex-role norms, and decisions about occupations. Communication Yearbook 4, New Brunswick: ICA, 1980.
- Brunner, C., & Phelps, L. A. Interpersonal communication competence and androgyny. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, May, 1980.
- Clavier, D. E., & Walker, B. A. Psychological androgyny and individual differences in an inequitable exchange of self-disclosure. Unpublished convention paper, 1980.
- Eman, V. A., & Dierks-Stewart., K. An examination of the psychometric adequacy of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, May, 1980.
- Fitzpatrick, M. Y., & Indivik, J. Implicit theories of communication in enduring relationships: Psychological gender differences in perception of one's self. Communication Yearbook 4, New Brunswick: ICA, 1980.

- Healy, J. J. A preliminary investigation of the relationship of androgyny to speech communication stress. Unpublished paper, California State University, Long Beach, 1980.
- Jacobson, L. M., and Shellen, W. N. Androgyny and self-disclosure among adults: Some discouraging words. Paper Presented at the International Communication Association Convention, May, 1980.
- Koontz, K. Psychological gender orientation and sex differences in language intensity usage. Paper Presented at the International Communication Association Convention, May, 1980.
- Lowry, D. N., & Jones, C. K. Predicting sex role by communicator style: The role of androgyny in Norton's communication style construct. Unpublished Convention Paper, 1980.
- Parks, M. R. A test of the cross-situational consistency of communication apprehension. Communication Monographs, 1980, 47, 220-232.
- Pier, J. C., & Nordstrom, K. E. Sex role identification and leadership behavior. Unpublished paper, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, 1980.
- Siegel, P. Androgyny, sex role rigidity, and homophobia. Paper Presented at the International Communication Association Convention, May, 1980.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., and Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peer-on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 1975, 29-39.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin & London: University of Texas Press, 1978.

CROSS SITUATIONAL CONSISTENCY OF COMMUNICATION
BEHAVIORS: ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS
TRUST/SATISFACTION

Any analysis of organizational communication relationships should focus on an examination of superior-subordinate interactions and co-workers' communication behaviors. Factors of interest include the amount of "openness" present, satisfaction with current relationships, and the amount of trust exhibited by either member of the organizational relationship. It is the purpose of this research study to test for the cross-situational consistency of trust, openness and satisfaction with organizational relationships as measured by the International Communication Audit instrument.

Many authors suggest that openness is an essential element for an effective organizational climate (Haney, 1967; Jablin, 1978a, Likert, 1967). A series of studies have examined the relationship between openness of the relationship and organizational performance (Indik, Georgopolus, & Seashore, 1961) and openness in the relationship and satisfaction with job (Baird, 1973, Jablin, 1977). Burke and Wilcox (1969) studied subordinates' perception of their superior's openness and predicted what the manager would suggest as a description of the relationship. Respondents were likely to see their manager as someone who was as open as they saw themselves. Additionally, the more agreement on openness the subordinate perceived with his/her superior the more satisfied he/she was with the company, the job, supervision and climate for growth. Along with openness, the concept of trust between superiors and subordinates is seen as an important contributing

variable to overall satisfaction.

There are several approaches to studying trust in interpersonal relationships. First, one could look at trust and interpersonal bargaining. Deutsch (1958) has defined trust as, "...if one individual expects another to be trustworthy, he engages in behavior which he perceives to have greater negative motivational consequences if the expectation is not confirmed than positive motivational consequences if it is confirmed." Suspicious persons expect the other to be untrustworthy and select behavior in which less is lost if the other behaves as expected than if he does not. Giffin (1967) defined trust as (1) relying on another, (2) risking something he values, and (3) attempting to achieve a desired goal. Another approach to defining trust is through the credibility literature. In essence, the more trust an audience has in a speaker the more likely they are to be persuaded by that speaker (Giffin, 1967).

Pearce (1974) defines trust as a situation in which there is some form of contingency between the truster and the trusted. The truster has some option other than engaging in trusting behavior. He calls these three conditions contingency, predictability, and alternative options. Wheelless and Grotz (1977) have defined trust as "...a process of holding certain relevant, favorable perceptions of another person which engender certain types of dependent behaviors in a risky situation where the expected outcomes that are dependent upon that other person are not known with certainty." Additionally, research has examined the relationship between trust and self-disclosure (Wheelless, 1973 and Wheelless & Grotz, 1977).

Satisfaction with communication relationships is less well defined.

As Goldhaber, et al. point out (1978): "The picture in this body of research (satisfaction with communication and organizational effectiveness) is confused and disjointed. While some evidence for a positive relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction has been presented the support has not been unequivocal" (p. 82). They continue by pointing out the difficulty with various definitions of communication satisfaction. No consistent relationship between communication satisfaction and other measures of organizational outcome or effectiveness has been found.

While the concept of communication satisfaction is unclear, researchers continue to suggest it as an important variable to study. Redding suggests that communication satisfaction ". . . does seem to offer a useful and practical way of describing an important aspect of organizational communication."

Recognizing the problems associated with previous approaches to the measurement of organizational communication, Division IV-Organizational Communication-of the International Communication Association decided in 1971 to begin the development of its own measurement system, called the I.C.A. Audit. After three years of development and two years of pilot testing, the Audit began collecting data from a number of different organizations. Currently, the data bank contains the results of over 20 audits. The "organizational relationship scale" in the I.C.A. Audit attempts to assess satisfaction within a number of specific relationships (i.e. co-worker and supervisors). "The idea behind these dimensions is that individuals feel some degree of satisfaction not only with their jobs and organizations but with the people who affect them in the organization" (Daly, et al.). Questionnaire responses

are perceptual about the individual's satisfaction with current organizational relationships. Four questions deal specifically with issues of trust (i.e. "I trust my co-workers") while twelve others deal with a more general measure of satisfaction (i.e. "My relationship with my supervisor is satisfying"). Four additional items measure the amount of influence the individual has on the organization (i.e. "I influence operations in my unit or department"). A factor analysis by Spiker (1979) clearly indicated that these last four items were different from the rest of the instrument. These four do not seem to measure interpersonal relationships in the organization and thus were not included as a part of the present research project. The audit uses Likert-like scales for all items with a rating of 1 to 5 (1 = very little with 5 = very great). Goldhaber has reported the reliability (co-efficient alpha) on the organizational relationship scale as .90. Porter (1979) reports an average inter-item correlation coefficient of .326 and notes, "...although the alpha reliability of .90 is substantial, PIAS also revealed that this reliability might be improved by the separate scoring of certain items." As a consequence, in the present study the factors dealing with trust were scored separately and the other 12 items dealing with satisfaction were summed disregarding the four items dealing with impact on the organization.

Based on conclusions from the ICA audit data bank, Goldhaber concludes, "...the most important contributor to job satisfaction as an organizational outcome appears to be organizational communication relationships, which alone accounted for 50.4 percent of the variance in the prediction of organizational outcomes" (p. 83). It would appear that this particular relationship scale is an important contributor to

the overall assessment of organizational health.

Underlying all of the research on trust, satisfaction, and openness as well as the development of the ICA audit instrument is the assumption that personality variables are relatively enduring or constant. While recognizing that organizational members may exhibit various levels of trust in different relationships, it is however, assumed that a person who possesses a high level of trust in his/her immediate supervisor will exhibit more trust across a variety of situations than an individual who possesses a low level of trust of his/her supervisor.

It is the intent of the present study to assess the validity of this assumption by testing for cross situational consistency of the communication variable of organizational trust and satisfaction. By using the ICA organizational relationship scale which measures trust and satisfaction with supervisors and co-workers, the current effort will test these variables across a variety of communication situations.

Methodology

The methodology used for this study closely parallels Parks (1980) test of the apprehension instrument. In order to test for the cross situational consistency of organizational relationships as measured by the ICA audit, a situation specific instrument was developed. The Situational Specific Measurement Inventory for Organizations (SSMIO) was developed in the following way: 60 communication situations were generated representing seven different communication contexts: size of group, familiarity with other in the interaction, authority or clearly defined roles, intimacy of information shared, confinement, ambiguity,

and channels of communication. For example, a situation indicating different roles was, "Telling the boss you want time off" or size of group, "Having your idea evaluated in a large committee meeting." A panel of five expert judges sorted the situations into each of the categories and only those situations achieving .80 interrater reliability were retrained. A stratified sample representing a variety of situational types was retrained so that the SSMIO had 35 communication situations represented.

One hundred sixty five subjects volunteered for the study. All were employed by a large midwestern university as staff personnel in entry level positions. Subjects were asked to complete the ICA Audit relationship scale and then the SSMIO. For each of the 35 communication situations subjects were asked: "For each situation indicate how much trust you would exhibit from very trusting (score 1) to not trusting at all (score 9). For each of the situations indicate how satisfied you would feel from very satisfied (score 1) to not at all satisfied (score 9). Additionally, each subject was asked to indicate if they had ever actually been in a situation like the one described.

Based on the subjects' scores on the ICA audit relationship instrument, subjects were divided into quartiles (low trust, medium low trust, medium high trust, and high trust and the same subgroups for satisfaction) following the procedure used by Parks with the apprehension instrument.

The following research question was tested: Does the ICA Audit Relationship Scale accurately predict trust and satisfaction scores across a variety of communication situations?

Results

A one-way ANOVA between the ICA Audit and the total trust and total satisfaction scores (the sum of the scores across 35 situations), did not reveal significant differences among the four groups' total satisfaction scores ($F = 2.08$, $df = 3, 161$, ns) and only approached significance for the four groups' total trust scores ($F = 2.66$, $df = 3, 161$, $p < .052$). However, mean scores for the groups increased in the expected direction (low trust subgroup $\bar{X} = 145$, $SD = 38.36$, medium low trust $\bar{X} = 146$, $SD = 36.30$, medium high trust group $\bar{X} = 128$, $SD = 42.73$, and high trust group $\bar{X} = 124$, $SD = 43.69$, while low satisfaction subgroup $\bar{X} = 161$, $SD = 29.83$, medium low satisfaction $\bar{X} = 146$, $SD = 30.0$, medium high satisfaction $\bar{X} = 146$, $SD = 37.11$, and high satisfaction $\bar{X} = 144$, $SD = 42.32$). This gave only slight support to the relationship between the ICA Audit and the SSMIO, since high scores on the SSMIO indicated low trust and low satisfaction.

The second general analysis examined the number of times subjects had actually experienced each of the 35 situations. The mean for the total subject population was 28.56. Thus, for 35 communication situations subjects had experienced approximately 28 or 80 percent of them indicating that the situations did represent events people might encounter regularly.

Analysis of Situational Differences

In order to test for cross situational consistency the SSMIO must represent significantly different communication situations. A factor analysis was used to determine if the SSMIO actually did describe different communication contexts. The scores on the 35 communication

situations for trust and satisfaction were submitted to a common factor analysis with varimax rotation to determine the number of factors. A three factor solution was found for both trust and satisfaction, using the "eigenvalue" greater than or equal to 1.0" criterion. The three factors on the satisfaction dimension seemed to be representing the following communication situations: Factor 1 had high loadings of items relating to "boss" interactions suggesting the "role" variable, Factor 2 was composed of all items dealing with interactions with close friends, and Factor 3 dealt with the size of a group that one might be interacting with (i.e. committee meeting, large group, etc.). The first factor accounted for 12.20 percent of the variance, Factor 2 accounted for 12.78 percent of the variance and Factor 3 accounted for 14.45 percent of the total variance. On the trust dimension Factor 1 dealt with the intimacy of information shared, for example one item was "Telling someone about your divorce." Factor 2 items dealt with interactions with close friends, and Factor 3 had items load high that dealt with boss interactions. Factor 1 on the trust dimension accounted for 12.4 percent of the total variance, Factor 2 accounted for 17.73 percent of the variance, and Factor 3 accounted for 13.68 percent of the variance. (See Table 1 & 2 for item loadings on satisfaction and trust).

Test for Cross Situational Consistency

In order to directly test for the predictability of the ICA Audit across a variety of communication contexts, the data was submitted to two final analyses. First, a multiple regression was completed in which the three factors were regressed upon the ICA Audit scores. Satisfaction results for Factor 1 yielded a significant multiple

correlation ($R = .21, p < .01$), and for Factor 2 and Factor 3 non significant results ($R = .20$ and 1.3 respectively). In this case the ICA audit predicted only one factor out of three across various situations. On the trust dimension, Factor 1 yielded significant results ($R = .23, p < .01$), Factor 2 was nonsignificant ($R = .10$) and Factor 3 was significant ($R = .20, p < .01$). In this case the ICA audit predicted two out of three factors across situations. Overall, the ICA audit accurately measured cross situational traits 50 percent of the time. The final analysis was a MANOVA with the four levels of trust and satisfaction on the ICA instrument serving as independent variables and the three factors as dependent variables. Neither multivariate effect was significant (satisfaction dimension, Wilks $\lambda = .95$, $F = 1.32$, $df = 3, 161$, ns; and trust Wilks $\lambda = .87$, $F = 1.79$, $df = 3, 161$, ns). The general pattern of results suggested that the ICA Audit relationship scale was not related to the three factors on trust and satisfaction in a similar way.

Discussion

Parks outlined two conditions that any trait measure must meet in order to be considered cross-situationally consistent. First, the measure must be significantly and positively correlated with the communication contexts measured on the SSMIO. In this case the ICA Audit Relationship Scale was related to one of the factors on the satisfaction dimension and two on the trust dimension. Thus, the ICA instrument meets this criteria only in a limited way. Second, there should be no significant difference in the ICA Audit's ability to predict trust and satisfaction from one situation to another. This condition

was not satisfied. On the satisfaction dimension the Audit instrument was more successful at predicting subjects' satisfaction with boss interactions than with close friends or in large groups. On the trust dimension, the TCA Audit was more successful at predicting trust when sharing intimate information and in interactions with boss than in predicting the level of trust exhibited with close friends.

Initially, Phelps and DeWine stated in the overview article, "If the original instrument is not predictive of communication behavior across 35 situations described in the SSMI, then we may well question most of the conclusions drawn from previous research about these communication variables." In the case of apprehension, androgyny, and organizational trust/satisfaction instruments, the present results in combination with Parks research, lend strong support to the "state" theory of these communication variables. Much of what we know about apprehension, trust, and relationship satisfaction might be reexamined in light of how behaviors may change and vary from one communication context to another.

References

- Barid, J. An analytical field study of "open communication" as perceived by superiors, subordinates and peers. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Purdue University, 1973.
- Burke, R. J., & Wilcox, D. S. Effects of different patterns and degrees of openness in superior-subordinate communication on subordinate job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 12, 319,326.
- Daly, J. A., Falcione, R. L., & Damhorst, M. L. Communication correlates of relational and organizational satisfaction: An audit based investigation. Paper presented to the International Communication Association, Philadelphia, 1979.
- Deutsch, M. Trust and suspicion. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2, 1958, 265-279.
- Giffin, K. The contribution of studies of source credibility to a theory of interpersonal trust in the communication process. Psychological Bulletin, 68, 1967, 104-120.
- Goldhaber, G., Yates, M., Porter, T., & Lesniak. Organizational communication: 1978. Human Communication Research, 5, Fall, 1978, 76-96.
- Goldhaber, G. M., Porter, D., and Yates, M. The I.C.A. Communication Audit Survey instrument: 1977 organizational norms. Paper presented to the International Communication Association, Berlin, Germany, 1977.

- Haney, W. V. Communication and organizational behavior (rev. ed). Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1967.
- Indik, B. P., Georgopoulos, B. S., & Seashore, S. B. Superior-subordinate relationships and performance. Personnel Psychology, 1961, 14, 357-374.
- Jablin, F. M. An experimental study of message-response in superior-subordinate communication. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Purdue University, 1977.
- _____. Superior-subordinate communication: The state of the art. Paper presented at the International Communication Association, Chicago, 1978. (a)
- Likert, R. The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Pearce, W. B. Trust in interpersonal communication. Speech Monographs, 41, August, 1974, 236-244.
- Porter, T. The ICA Communication Audit: 1979. Norms and Instrument Documentation for 17 Audits Using the Survey (1974-1979). Unpublished paper, Purdue University, 1979.
- Redding, W. C. Communication within the organizations: An interpretative review of theory and research. New York: Industrial Communication Council, 1972.
- Spiker, B. Organizations communication relationships and receiving information: An empirical validation across organizations. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio University, 1979.
- Wheless, L. R., & Groty, I. The measurement of trust and its relationship to self-disclosure. Human Communication Research, 3, Spring, 1977, 250-257.

Wheeless, L. R. Effects of explicit credibility statement by more
credible and less credible sources. Southern Speech Communication
Journal, 1974, 39, 33-39.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Factor Loading for
Trust Situational Instrument

	Mean	SD	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
1. Tell a large group you got a new job.	3.45	2.17	0.26	0.37	0.25
2. Giving a speech to a large committee meeting.	4.79	2.32	0.13	-0.09	-0.07
3. A close friend tells you the latest job report.	2.85	1.97	-0.14	0.64	0.03
4. You complain to a close friend about your job.	2.24	1.79	0.03	0.76	-0.08
5. Telling a close friend you are unhappy about not being promoted.	3.04	2.33	0.02	0.81	0.09
6. Telling someone about your divorce.	4.28	2.64	0.51	0.33	0.12
7. Telling a close friend the job is too challenging.	3.56	2.26	0.06	0.68	0.20
8. Giving a two-week notice over the phone.	5.44	2.44	-0.01	0.07	0.08
9. Telling the boss you need some time off.	3.41	2.08	-0.06	0.18	0.71
10. Telling a close friend you are quitting.	2.65	2.11	0.15	0.73	0.25
11. Hearing your idea evaluated in a large committee meeting.	4.35	2.30	0.01	0.03	0.20
12. Receiving praise from a large group.	3.13	2.23	0.01	0.53	0.11
13. Telling your boss you will be late tomorrow.	3.16	1.85	0.21	0.14	0.79
14. Asking your boss for a leave of absence.	3.60	2.15	0.09	0.15	0.76
15. Speaking to a large group of new workers.	3.82	2.22	0.12	0.31	0.18

Table 1 continued

		Mean	SD	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
16.	Leading a small group discussing new organizational policies.	3.68	2.12	0.18	0.30	0.21
17.	Telling a close friend s/he is not getting the work done.	4.46	2.37	0.08	0.13	0.12
18.	Interviewing for a job.	3.82	2.14	0.09	0.11	0.58
19.	Asking a co-worker to loan you five dollars.	4.04	2.48	0.39	0.06	0.20
20.	Presenting a slide show to a large committee.	4.44	2.38	0.13	0.05	0.15
21.	Asking a close friend's opinion of your latest report.	3.03	1.99	0.16	0.50	0.40
22.	Telling your boss you are looking for another job.	4.98	2.49	0.20	0.08	0.20
23.	Telling a co-worker you do not trust the boss.	4.79	2.66	0.77	-0.00	0.01
24.	Telling a co-worker the amount of your raise.	4.78	2.73	0.68	-0.02	0.07
25.	Telling a co-worker you are looking for a new job.	4.20	2.45	0.68	0.20	0.19
26.	Telling the boss you do not want to answer customer complaints.	5.00	2.33	0.22	0.03	0.24
27.	Telling the boss you feel you do not participate enough.	4.16	2.37	0.38	-0.05	0.25
28.	Telling the boss the job is not challenging enough.	4.21	2.51	0.21	0.02	0.19
29.	In a letter, tell a co-worker apprehensive about upcoming meeting.	4.04	2.36	0.30	0.22	0.05
30.	In a large committee support someone's idea.	3.04	1.91	0.09	0.28	0.11
31.	In a large committee meeting recognize the performance of a co-worker.	3.00	1.99	0.10	0.18	0.16
32.	Openly criticize the boss's idea.	4.95	2.65	0.28	0.07	0.09

Table 1 continued

	Mean	SD	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
33. The boss self-discloses to you s/he is terminally ill.	2.87	2.23	-0.04	0.21	-0.12
34. Telling your boss an assignment will be late.	4.35	2.41	0.21	0.12	0.28
35. Filing a grievance with a supervisor.	4.47	2.36	0.31	0.02	0.29

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics and Factor Loading for
Satisfaction Situational Instrument

	Mean	SD	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
1. Tell a large group you got a new job.	4.21	2.51	0.07	0.35	0.48
2. Giving a speech to a large committee meeting.	4.04	2.36	-0.27	-0.10	0.59
3. A close friend tells you the latest job report.	3.04	1.91	0.12	0.24	0.12
4. You complain to a close friend about your job.	3.00	1.99	-0.03	0.55	0.08
5. Telling a close friend you are unhappy about not being promoted.	4.95	2.65	0.04	0.76	0.05
6. Telling someone about your divorce.	2.87	2.23	0.13	0.26	0.11
7. Telling a close friend the job is too challenging.	4.35	2.41	0.26	0.59	-0.07
8. Giving a two-week notice over the phone.	4.35	2.41	0.03	0.02	0.11
9. Telling the boss you need some time off.	4.70	2.52	0.61	0.07	-0.03
10. Telling a close friend you are quitting.	5.45	2.54	0.10	0.74	0.06
11. Hearing your idea evaluated in a large committee meeting.	4.83	2.99	-0.07	-0.05	0.54
12. Receiving praise from a large group.	4.67	2.61	0.04	0.36	0.26
13. Telling your boss you will be late tomorrow.	3.45	2.15	0.68	0.13	0.02
14. Asking your boss for a leave of absence.	3.82	2.23	0.79	0.12	0.16
15. Speaking to a large group of new workers.	3.81	2.21	0.16	0.09	0.75

Table continued

		Mean	SD	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
16.	Leading a small group discussing new organizational policies.	3.76	2.06	0.27	0.13	0.66
17.	Telling a close friend s/he is not getting the work done.	5.88	2.38	0.40	0.09	0.23
18.	Interviewing for a job.	3.73	2.20	0.21	0.07	0.26
19.	Asking a co-worker to loan you five dollars.	5.00	2.56	0.32	0.08	0.27
20.	Presenting a slide show to a large committee.	4.21	2.36	0.06	0.00	0.59
21.	Asking a close friend's opinion of your latest report.	3.50	2.03	0.37	0.44	0.31
22.	Telling your boss you are looking for another job.	5.45	2.43	0.15	0.13	0.08
23.	Telling a co-worker you do not trust the boss.	5.18	2.52	-0.06	-0.05	-0.14
24.	Telling a co-worker the amount of your raise.	5.00	2.59	0.17	-0.03	0.11
25.	Telling a co-worker you are looking for a new job.	4.40	2.36	0.03	0.30	0.14
26.	Telling the boss you do not want to answer customer complaints.	5.35	2.37	0.27	0.07	-0.00
27.	Telling the boss you feel you do not participate enough.	4.35	2.40	0.17	-0.06	0.19
28.	Telling the boss the job is not challenging enough.	4.38	2.51	0.07	0.15	0.15
29.	In a letter, tell a co-worker apprehensive about upcoming meeting.	4.21	2.27	0.00	-0.01	0.11
30.	In a large committee support someone's idea.	3.10	2.02	-0.03	0.14	0.29
31.	In a large committee meeting recognize the performance of a co-worker	3.13	2.12	0.12	0.12	0.37
32.	Openly criticize the boss's idea.	4.67	2.61	0.01	0.05	0.08

Table continued

		Mean	SD	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
33.	The boss self-discloses to you s/he is terminally ill.	4.83	3.00	0.10	0.19	0.06
34.	Telling your boss an assignment will be late.	5.45	2.55	0.38	0.08	0.07
35.	Filing a grievance with a supervisor.	4.71	2.52	0.17	0.06	-0.02